



UGB / Commercial Industrial Buildable Lands (CIBL) Stakeholder Committee

Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 22nd, 2009

6:00pm – 8:00pm

Springfield City Hall
225 Fifth Street, Springfield, OR
Library Meeting Room

These minutes summarize the discussion of the Committee. A record of the full discussion is provided on the city's website along with other materials from this and past Committee meetings.

I. Attendance:

Stakeholders: Brianna Huber, Mike Kelly, George Grier, Lee Beyer, Kari Westlund, Johnny Kirschenmann, Naomi Campollo, Dave Marra, Doug McKay, Dan Egan, Guy Weese, Steven Yett, Philip Farrington, Don Oldenburg.

Staff: David Reesor; Linda Pauly; Bob Parker; Beth Goodman; Bill Grile; John Tamulonis; Mark Metzger

II. Greetings / Routine Business

1. Roll Call
2. Review of Minutes – Minutes approved as written
3. Public Testimony – None noted

III. Review of Employment and Residential lands Opportunity Area

Bob Parker presented a 15 minute summary of the input from the City Council, Planning Commission and Technical Advisory Committee concerning the ten "Opportunity Areas" using the memorandum, "Summary of Input from Council/Planning Commission..." that was included in the meeting packet. Areas 9 and 10 were grouped together for the discussion and map.

Shown below are a few key statements made about each Opportunity Area:

Area 1: North Gateway Area

The primary constraints are transportation related. Stacking at the Gateway/Beltline intersection is an issue that has repercussions for the I-5 interchange as well as local traffic.

Area 2: Hayden Bridge Area

There may be deed restrictions on land in the area limiting additional land division. There may be wetland constraints in the area as well.

Area 3: North Springfield Highway Area

There are concerns about the accuracy of floodplain mapping for the area. It is likely that there are serious floodplain and floodway issues in this area. Improvements are planned for the Hwy 126/52nd Street interchange that may improve access to Hwy 126 from Area 3. Area 3 drains to Cedar Creek which has been noted to be at capacity already.

Area 4: Far East Springfield Area

Cedar Creek drainage capacity is also a constraint for this area. There are also steep slope constraints affecting parts of the area.

Area 5: Wallace Creek Road Area

Slope issues make this area a better candidate for residential development than employment uses.

Area 6: West Jasper/Jasper Bridge Area

Floodplain issues and the complications of crossing the Willamette River with urban services are significant constraints.

Area 7: Clearwater Area

The TAC raised a question about whether the rail line which runs parallel to Jasper Rd. would limit access to the site. The area was thought to be a better candidate for residential development than employment uses.

Area 8: South of Millrace Area

Transportation access to the area is limited to South 28th at this time. SUB's Willamette wellfield in the southwest corner of Area 8 may complicate development for employment uses, depending on the type of use and the chemicals used.

Area 9 Seavey Loop and Goshen Area

Areas 9 and 10 were combined for discussion as per direction from the last meeting. TAC members suggested that a separate wastewater treatment facility may be required to serve the area. The rail line may limit transportation access to the area. The 30th Ave/I-5 interchange is scheduled for improvement. The improvements may enhance access to this area.

General Discussion about the Opportunity Area Summary

Committee members asked about how they could recommend/prioritize opportunity areas without knowing in more detail how much of each area is free of constraints. Staff indicated that the Committee, at this step in the process, is to provide feedback of a general nature that identifies both opportunities and constraints for each site. The prioritization process helps staff to focus their attention as they continue to refine their analysis potential expansion area. Staff will work in

the coming months to more carefully calculate the extent of known constraints on each site and to gather additional information from Public Works on the serviceability of each site.

Concerns were expressed that identifying potential expansion areas that might trigger speculative buying of land in agricultural areas. Such speculation could drive land prices up and make in doing so, take them out of agricultural production by making them too expensive.

Prioritization of Employment Opportunity Areas

The Committee first considered the prioritization of sites offered by the TAC and discussed their own priority areas. Discussion led to recommendations for first tier (high priority) second tier (middle priority) and third tier (low priority) sites.

After extensive discussion staff summarized the Committee prioritization for employment uses and asked for confirmation that the priority list was accurate. The list is shown below

Priority Employment Opportunity Areas

High Priority	North Gateway (Area 1); Seavey Loop/Goshen (Areas 9/10)
Middle Priority	South of Millrace (Area 8); Hayden Bridge (Area 2); North Springfield Highway (Area 3)
Low Priority	Far East Springfield (Area 4); Wallace Creek Road (Area 5); West Jasper/Jasper Bridge (Area 6); Clearwater (Area 7)

Prioritization of Residential Lands

The Committee asked for clarification about "next steps" and how the Residential Lands Study will be integrated with the CIBL work. Staff reiterated that the Committee's work will give staff focus for refining the opportunity site analysis and in doing so, these broad areas would shrink. Following this time of more detailed staff analysis, a public workshop (or other similar public outreach) would be conducted to seek landowner and general public feedback on the opportunity areas. The process would culminate in a joint meeting of the Committee and the Springfield Planning Commission to look at a refined opportunity area recommendation.

Staff provided some background on the work of the Residential Lands Committee which last met in 2007. The Residential Committee established the assumptions and definitions to be used in identifying an inventory of residential buildable lands. These were reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and City Council. Work on the Residential Lands study has been delayed while Lane County sought to compile a "coordinated population estimate" which includes an assumed rate of growth for each city in the county. This growth rate estimate is essential to projecting the land supply that will be needed to meet future housing needs.

City staff first proposed an average annual growth rate of 1.7% based on the average annual growth rate that had actually occurred since the 1999 Eugene-Springfield Residential Lands Study was adopted. Based on that rate of growth a preliminary land need of about 1000 acres was estimated.

More recently, the Council chose to adopt the new "safe harbor" population projection of about 1.1% in hopes of reducing exposure to appeal and expediting the approval process.

Staff indicated that they hope to return to the Committee at its February 26th meeting with a more definitive residential land need estimate.

Staff emphasized that for this meeting, the focus of discussion of potential residential sites and their priority should be kept at a broad level as has been the case with the employment lands.

Priority Residential Opportunity Lands**

Higher Priority	Far East Springfield (Area 4); Wallace Creek Road (Area 5); West Jasper/Jasper Bridge (Area 6); Clearwater (Area 7)
Lower Priority	North Gateway (Area 1); North Springfield Highway (Area 3); South of Millrace (Area 8); Seavey Loop/Goshen (Areas 9/10)

**The Committee engaged in a round-robin discussion of their priority residential lands but did not come to consensus/closure as it did with the employment lands. It was recognized that some of the high priority employment lands had some potential for residential development because of their size and or constraints. Some of the higher value residential areas listed on the table are burdened with significant constraints. This table is a broad interpretation of the input provided by Committee members. No attempt was made to differentiate between "high, medium and low priority."

Closing Remarks

Committee members expressed a desire to have more specific direction for discussion. Provide more direction for members so that they can provide more specific input. Members also asked for a more specific description of the "next steps" in the process and the role that the Committee will be asked to play.

Chairperson Egan expressed his strongly held opinion that cheesecake should be provided in celebration of the Committee's work at the February 26 meeting.